



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,899	04/09/2007	Wulf Schormair	CS881/BCS033096	1918
34469	7590	01/22/2009	EXAMINER	
BAYER CROPSCIENCE LP			STEPHENH III, JOSE S	
Patent Department			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2 T.W. ALEXANDER DRIVE				3728
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/22/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/581,899	SCHORMAIR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 11-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 11-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/06/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action acknowledges the applicant's amendment filed 29 September 2008. Claims 11-16 are pending in the application; and claims 1-10 have been canceled.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips (US Patent 5,060,998) in view of McQuade et al. (US Patent 5,507,544).

With respect to claim 11, figures 5 and 11 of Phillips teach a combined pack which contains the following constituent parts comprising two or more storage containers 22 a device (see figure 5), which fixedly connects the storage containers, wherein the device comprises the following constituent parts a connector 12c and

closure 14, wherein the connector is pushed through the handles 30 of the storage containers and the closure is plugged on wherein the connector and the closure are form-fitting. Phillips does not teach the device comprises a wall with two holes, a closure with two arresting means, or a cavity to the right of the wall, wherein the two arresting means on the closure fit into the holes on the wall. Official notice is taken that it is old and conventional to provide a snap fit with arresting means that fit into holes to connectors and closures for better securing the two together. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of the official notice to provide arresting means and holes to the connector and closure of Phillips, since, whether the connector and closure are connected by having arresting means that fit into holes or any other art recognized equivalent is an obvious matter of choice. Phillips also does not teach the storage containers comprise a closure. However, figure 8 of McQuade et al. teaches a combined pack which contains the following constituent parts comprising two or more storage containers ( $J_1$  and  $J_2$ ) each having closure ( $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ) and a handle ( $H_1$  and  $H_2$ ), and a device 10 that fixedly connects the storage container. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the device of Phillips through the handles of the two storage containers of McQuade et al. to provide a device that is easier to carry because of the cylindrical shape of the connector.

With respect to claim 12, figure 8 of McQuade et al. teaches the storage containers are canisters.

With respect to claim 13, the combination of Phillips and McQuade et al. disclose the claimed invention except for size of the canisters. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the sizes of the canisters, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

With respect to claim 14, figure 8 of McQuade et al. teaches the device and/or the storage containers are made of plastic (see column 2, lines 62-67).

With respect to claim 15, figure 8 of McQuade et al. teaches the combined pack packages pourable materials.

With respect to claim 16, the combination of combination of Phillips and McQuade et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the pourable material is a crop protection agent. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to place a crop protection agent in the canisters. The canisters are clearly capable of container several different types of liquids.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shown are combined packs analogous to applicant's instant invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSE S. STEPHENS III whose telephone number is 571-270-3797. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JILA M MOHANDESI/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3728

JSS  
01/20/09